

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,063	08/20/2004	Shinsuke Fujiwara	039.0046	5062
29453 7590 06/22/2007 JUDGE & MURAKAMI IP ASSOCIATES DOJIMIA BUILDING, 7TH FLOOR 6-8 NISHITEMMA 2-CHOME, KITA-KU			EXAMINER	
			GUHARAY, KARABI	
OSAKA-SHI,		A-KU	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
JAPAN			2879	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	10/711,063	FUJIWARA, SHINSUKE
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Karabi Guharay	2879
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEL	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-17 is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	n from consideration.	
Application Papers		
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected the drawing (s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing (s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priority documents 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/04; 10/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-14 in the reply filed on 4/27/07 is acknowledged.

Claims 15-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group II, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/27/07.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

Figures 11-13 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

Art Unit: 2879

of the following is required: Claim 7 which is dependent from claim 1, recites a second LED along with a first LED, which is not taught or illustrated in the disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12 & 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Menkara et al. (US 2005/0023962).

Regarding claims 1-3 & 5, Menkara et al. disclose a white light emitting device comprising a first LED (Fig 2) and at least one first phosphor $ZnS_X Se_{1-X} (0< X<1)$ containing at least one activator among Cu, Ag, and Au and sending forth light when stimulated by rays irradiated from the first LED (Paragraphs 26, 43-44 & 52).

Regarding claim 4, Menkara et al. disclose that the first phosphor $ZnS_X Se_{1-X}$ (0<X<1) is in clumplike form or powered form (paragraph 53).

Regarding claim 6, Menkara et al. disclose a white light emitting device wherein the first phosphor $ZnS_X Se_{1-X} (0.4 \le X \le 0.5)$ contains the activator Ag and sends forth light stimulated by rays in a range of wavelengths 410nm to 490 nm irradiated the first LED (paragraph 55).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claims 8-10, Menkara et al. disclose first and second phosphor with the LED which emit light of wavelength longer than the wavelength of the light emitted by LED and provide white light emission (see paragraph 43) and also teaches a phosphor $ZnS_X Se_{1-X} (0<X<1)$ and further teaches different color emission from this phosphor by varying the value of X (see paragraphs 54-56).

Regarding claim 11, Menkara et al. disclose (see Fig 2) that the clumplike phosphor is mounted on, so as to mate surfaces with the first LED (paragraph 42).

Regarding claim 12, Menkara discloses (Fig 2) the Lead frame mounted LEDs though does not specifically mentioned heat dissipation member, it is well known that the lead frames act as heat dissipation member, and since phosphor is mounted on the LED chip it mates with the lead frame member.

Regarding claim 14, examiner notes that the claim limitation of "the first phosphor is heat treated in an atmosphere containing Zn vapor" is drawn to a process of manufacturing, which is incidental to the claimed apparatus.

Even though product by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art structure by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject process limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Art Unit: 2879

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menkara et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fujiwara (JP2003-347588).

Regarding claim 13, Menkara discloses all the limitations of claims 12-13, including a blue emitting LED, except for InGaN being used as LED.

However, in the same field of white light emitting device, Fujiwara teaches use of InGaN for blue emitting LED (see Fig 4, item 27) where the zinc sulfo-selenide fluorescent material (28) is disposed on the LED.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate InGaN for blue emitting LED in the device of Menkara since it is a well known material used in the art as blue emitting LED as taught by Fujiwara.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menkara et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shimizu et al. (US 6817735).

Regarding claim 7, Menkara discloses all the limitations of claim 7 except for having a second LED for irradiating red light.

Art Unit: 2879

However, Shimizu et al. in the same field of white light emission uses a blue emitting LED with a phosphor and a second LED emitting red (see lines 44-50 of column 1 and lines 46-51 of column 2) and further teaches that such configuration of light emission provides high efficiency and high color rendering performance (see Abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use plurality of LEDs as taught by Shimizu et al. in the device of Menkara since this will provide high efficiency and high color rendering performances.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karabi Guharay whose telephone number is 571-272-2452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 7

Rymharray Karabi Guharay Primary Examiner Art Unit 2879 6/18/07